arXiv:1406.4895v1 [math.CO] 18 Jun 2014

COMPUTING THE EXTENSION COMPLEXITIES OF ALL 4-DIMENSIONAL 0/1-POLYTOPES

MICHAEL OELZE[1], ARNAUD VANDAELE[2], AND STEFAN WELTGE[3]

ABSTRACT. We present slight refinements of known general lower and upper bounds on sizes of extended formulations for polytopes. With these observations we are able to compute the extension complexities of all 0/1-polytopes up to dimension 4. We provide a complete list of our results including geometric constructions of minimum size extensions for all considered polytopes. Furthermore, we show that all of these extensions have strong properties. In particular, one of our computational results is that every 0/1-polytope up to dimension 4 has a minimum size extension that is also a 0/1-polytope.

1. INTRODUCTION

The theory of extended formulations is a fast-developing research field that adresses the problem of writing a polytope as the projection of a preferably simpler polyhedron. More precisely, given a polytope $P \in \mathbb{R}^p$, a polyhedron $Q \in \mathbb{R}^q$ together with a linear map $\pi\colon \mathbb{R}^q \to \mathbb{R}^p$ is an *extension* of P if $\pi(Q) = P$. An explicit outer description of Q by linear inequalities and equations is called an *extended formulation* for P. The *size* of an extension (Q, π) is defined as the number of the facets of Q. The quantity of major interest in the field of extended formulations is the so-called *extension complexity* of a polytope P, which is defined as the smallest size of any extension of P and is denoted by $\mathrm{xc}(P)$. Equivalently, $\mathrm{xc}(P)$ is the smallest number of inequalities in any extended formulation for P.

The concept of extended formulations is motivated by the following fact: Suppose that (Q, π) is an extension of P. Then optimizing a linear function $x \mapsto \langle c, x\rangle$ over P is equivalent to maximizing $y \mapsto \langle \pi^*(c), y\rangle$ over Q, where π^* is the adjoint map of π. Of course, if Q admits a simpler outer description than P, then this might have a substantial impact on the performance of algorithms solving such optimization problems. Since $0/1$-polytopes (i.e., polytopes with vertices in $\{0,1\}^p$) play a central role in the application of linear programming, they are also of particiular interest in the field of extended formulations.

Current research is mainly driven by the seminal results of Fiorini et al. [6] and Rothvoß [14] that give exponential lower bounds on the extension complexities of the TSP polytope and the matching polytope, respectively. While they answered two of the most important questions in the area of extended formulations, there are still many (sometimes even elementary) open questions. By giving a complete list of the extension complexities of all $0/1$-polytopes up to dimension 4, one aim of this paper is to provide a first reference that hopefully allows progress on those questions.

For instance, it is not known whether for any rational polytope P there exists a rational extension of size $\mathrm{xc}(P)$, not even if P is a $0/1$-polytope. As a consequence of observations

[1]OTTO-VON-GUERICKE-UNIVERSITÄT MAGDEBURG (GERMANY), michael5oelze@gmail.com
[2]UNIVERSITÉ DE MONS (BELGIUM), arnaud.vandaele@umons.ac.be
[3]OTTO-VON-GUERICKE-UNIVERSITÄT MAGDEBURG (GERMANY), weltge@ovgu.de

mainly made in Section 2, our computational results show that all $0/1$-polytopes up to dimension 4 admit minimum size extensions that are even $0/1$-polytopes. Surprisingly, in all those extensions Q there is a 1-to-1 correspondence between the vertices of Q and their images.

Another motivation for this work was the fact that, in general, computing $\mathrm{xc}(P)$ for a given polytope P seems to be a non-trivial task. Note that, from its original definition, it is not obvious how to compute the extension complexity of a polytope. However, due to Yannakakis' theorem [15], we know that computing $\mathrm{xc}(P)$ is equivalent to computing the nonnegative rank of one of its slack matrices (see Section 3 for the precise definitions and the statement). For reasonable numbers of facets and vertices, it is possible to compute slack matrices using the double description method, which is, for instance, efficiently implemented in `cdd` [7] and used by `polymake` [8]. Further, computing the exact nonnegative rank of a matrix can be reduced to the decision problem whether certain semi-algebraic sets are nonempty. Arora et al. [2] give a subtle construction of such sets whose descriptions are much smaller than in naive approaches. Thus, in principle, it is possible to compute the extension complexity of a polytope by finally using quantifier elimination algorithms as in [4]. However, such general approaches still do not allow computations for polytopes of reasonable complexity. In contrast, our calculations are based on very specific observations yielding matching lower and upper bounds on $\mathrm{xc}(P)$. Hence, they can be performed within a total time of few minutes using simple scripts as well as `polymake` for computing slack matrices.

Regarding our specific task, note that the extension complexity is obviously invariant under affine transformations. Thus, when talking about $0/1$-polytopes of dimension k, we implicitly refer to full-dimensional polytopes with vertices in $\{0,1\}^k$. (It is a basic fact that any $0/1$-polytope of dimension k is affinely isomorphic to a full-dimensional $0/1$-polytope in ambient dimension k.) Formally, there are $2^{2^4} = 65536$ polytopes with vertices in $\{0,1\}^4$ – most of them being 4-dimensional. Of course, it suffices to consider only representatives of each affine equivalence class. It turns out that there are still 202 distinct affine equivalence classes of $0/1$-polytopes of dimension 4. While we also give results for (the few) $0/1$-polytopes up to dimension three, our work mainly focusses on the more challenging class of 4-dimensional $0/1$-polytopes.

Our paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we describe known, simple geometric constructions for extended formulations and show that they preserve interesting properties. In order to obtain tight bounds on $\mathrm{xc}(P)$, we carefully analyze the sizes of the resulting extensions. In Section 3, we recall known general lower bounds on the extension complexity of a polytope and present a refinement of the rectangle covering bound, which yields improved bounds but is still computable by rather simple combinatorial algorithms. Finally, in Section 4, we describe our approach of computing all extensions complexities and present computational results.

1.1. **Notation.** The standard euclidean scalar product and norm are denoted by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ and $\|\cdot\|$, respectively. For a nonnegative integer k, we set $[k] := \{1, \dots, k\}$. The k-dimensional nonnegative orthant is denoted by $\mathbb{R}^k_+$. We use $\Delta_k := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^k_+ : \sum_{i=1}^k x_i = 1\}$ to denote the standard $(k-1)$-simplex. The zero vector will be denoted by $\mathbb{0}$, whose dimension will always be clear from the context. For a polyhedron P, we use $\mathrm{rec}(P)$ to denote its recession cone. Further, $\#\mathrm{facets}(P)$ and $\#\mathrm{vertices}(P)$ denote the number of facets of P and number of vertices of P, respectively.

2. Geometric Upper Bounds

In this section, we review known bounds on the extension complexity that are based on simple geometric constructions. We show that some bounds can be sligthly strengthened in relevant cases, which will be essential for the computations in Section 4. Besides, we show that in our cases, the corresponding constructions preserve the following, strong properties:

Definition 1. Let P be a $0/1$-polytope and (Q, π) be an extension for P. Then (Q, π) is called a *nice* $0/1$*-extension* if

(i) Q is a $0/1$-polytope,
(ii) each vertex of Q is projected onto a vertex of P and
(iii) for each vertex v of P there is exactly one vertex of Q that projects onto v.

The smallest size of any nice $0/1$-extension of P is denoted by $\mathrm{xc}^*(P)$.

Clearly, we have that $\mathrm{xc}(P) \leq \mathrm{xc}^*(P)$ holds for any $0/1$-polytope P. In general, the requirements of the above definition seem to be very restrictive. In fact, in [13] it was shown that there exist polytopes for which no minimum size extension satisfies property (ii). However, the polytopes constructed in that paper were not $0/1$-polytopes. In particular, we will see that all minimum size constructions that are implicitly generated by our computations are indeed nice $0/1$-extensions.

Remark 1. Our convention of restricting projections to be linear instead of affine maps is just a technical requirement: Indeed, if $P = \alpha(Q)$ for an affine map α, define $Q' := \{(x, y) : x = \alpha(y),\, y \in Q\}$, which is affinely isomorphic to Q, let π be the linear projection onto the x-coordinates and obtain that (Q', π) is an extension for P. Moreover, if P is a $0/1$-polytope and (Q, α) satisfies the above-named properties (i)–(iii), then so does (Q', π). In particular, we still have that $\mathrm{xc}(P) = \mathrm{xc}(P')$ and $\mathrm{xc}^*(P) = \mathrm{xc}^*(P')$ holds for affinely isomorphic polytopes P, P'.

Let us start with two trivial known upper bounds on the extension complexity of a polytope $P \subseteq \mathbb{R}^p$. First, choosing $Q = P$ and $\pi\colon \mathbb{R}^p \to \mathbb{R}^p$ as the identity, any polytope is an extension of itself. Second, if $P = \mathrm{conv}(\{v^1, \ldots, v^k\})$ for some points $v^1, \ldots, v^k \in \mathbb{R}^p$, then we obviously have that

$$P = \Big\{ \sum\nolimits_{i=1}^{k} \lambda_i v^i : \lambda_j \geq 0 \,\forall\, j \in [k],\, \sum\nolimits_{j=1}^{k} \lambda_j = 1 \Big\}.$$

Thus, setting $Q = \Delta_k$ and $\pi(\lambda) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \lambda_i v^i$, we obtain that P is a linear projection of a $(k-1)$-simplex. Since both are clearly nice $0/1$-extensions if P is a $0/1$-polytope, we conclude:

Proposition 2.1. *For a* $0/1$*-polytope* P *it holds that*

- $\mathrm{xc}^*(P) \leq \#\mathrm{facets}(P)$ *and*
- $\mathrm{xc}^*(P) \leq \#\mathrm{vertices}(P)$. □

In fact, for some $0/1$-polytopes such trivial extensions are indeed best possible. Let us now describe two more subtle ways to construct extended formulations.

2.1. Unions of Polytopes.

For a polyhedron $Q = \{y : Ay \leq b\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^q$ let us denote its homogenization cone by

$$\mathrm{homog}(Q) = \{(y, \lambda) : Ay \leq \lambda b,\, \lambda \geq 0\} = \{(y, \lambda) : y \in \lambda \cdot Q,\, \lambda \geq 0\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{q+1}.$$

Since Balas' famous work [3] on Disjunctive Programming, we know that for polytopes $P_1, \dots, P_k \in \mathbb{R}^p$, the convex hull of their union $P = \operatorname{conv}(\cup_{i=1}^k P_i)$ can be described via

$$P = \Big\{ \sum\nolimits_{i=1}^k x^i : (x^i, \lambda_i) \in \operatorname{homog}(P_i)\ \forall\, i \in [k],\ \sum\nolimits_{i=1}^k \lambda_i = 1 \Big\}.$$

Given extensions (Q_i, π_i) for each P_i, as a direct consequence, we obtain

$$P = \Big\{ \sum\nolimits_{i=1}^k \pi_i(y^i) : (y^i, \lambda_i) \in \operatorname{homog}(Q_i)\ \forall\, i \in [k],\ \sum\nolimits_{i=1}^k \lambda_i = 1 \Big\}. \tag{1}$$

Thus, choosing each extension (Q_i, π_i) of minimum size, this immediatly implies the well-known upper bound $\operatorname{xc}(P) \leq \sum_{i=1}^k (\operatorname{xc}(P_i) + 1)$, see, e.g., [10]. However, we show that this bound can be slightly improved in most of the cases:

Theorem 2.2. *For polytopes $P_1, \dots, P_k \in \mathbb{R}^p$ it holds that*

$$\operatorname{xc}\big(\operatorname{conv}(\cup_{i=1}^k P_i)\big) \leq \sum_{i=1}^k \operatorname{xc}(P_i) + |\{i \in [k] : \dim(P_i) = 0\}|.$$

When proving Theorem 2.2, we will make use of the following (known) useful fact.

Lemma 2.3. *For any polytope P there exists an extension (Q, π) of minimum size such that Q is a polytope.*

Proof. See Appendix A.1.

Proof of Theorem 2.2. For $i = 1, \dots, k$ let (Q_i, π_i) be a minimum size extension for P_i. By Lemma 2.3, we further may assume that all Q_i's are polytopes. By equation (1), it suffices to show that $\#\operatorname{facets}(\operatorname{homog}(Q_i)) \leq \#\operatorname{facets}(Q_i)$ for all $i \in [k]$ with $\dim(P_i) > 0$.

Towards this end, suppose that $\dim(P_j) > 0$ and let $Q_j = \{y : Ay \leq b\}$. We will show that $\operatorname{homog}(Q_j) = \{(y, \lambda) : Ay \leq \lambda b,\ \lambda \in \mathbb{R}\}$ (and hence $\#\operatorname{facets}(\operatorname{homog}(Q_j)) \leq \#\operatorname{facets}(Q_j)$) holds. In order to show that the inequality $\lambda \geq 0$ is indeed not facet-defining for $\operatorname{homog}(Q_j)$ (and hence redundant), let us assume the contrary and obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\dim(\operatorname{homog}(Q_j)) &= \dim(\{(y,0) \in \operatorname{homog}(Q_j)\}) + 1 \\
&= \dim(\{(y,0) : Ay \leq \mathbb{O}\}) + 1 \\
&= \dim(\operatorname{rec}(Q_j) \times \{0\}) + 1 \\
&= \dim(\{\mathbb{O}\} \times \{0\}) + 1 = 1.
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, we have that $\dim(\operatorname{homog}(Q_j)) = \dim(Q_j) + 1 \geq \dim(P_j) + 1 \geq 2$, a contradiction. □

It turns out that Theorem 2.2 can even be rephrased in terms of $\operatorname{xc}^*(\cdot)$ under a further assumption:

Theorem 2.4. *For disjoint $0/1$-polytopes $P_1, \dots, P_k \in \mathbb{R}^p$ it holds that*

$$\operatorname{xc}^*\big(\operatorname{conv}(\cup_{i=1}^k P_i)\big) \leq \sum_{i=1}^k \operatorname{xc}^*(P_i) + |\{i : \dim(P_i) = 0\}|.$$

Proof. For $i = 1, \dots, k$ let (Q_i, π_i) be a nice $0/1$-extension. Since the Q_i's are polytopes and due to the proof of Theorem 2.2, it suffices to show that the polytope

$$Q = \Big\{ (y^1, \dots, y^k, w) : (y^i, w_i) \in \operatorname{homog}(Q_i)\ \forall\, i \in [k],\ \sum\nolimits_{i=1}^k w_i = 1 \Big\}.$$

together with $\pi(y^1,\dots,y^k,w)=\sum_{i=1}^k \pi_i(y^i)$ is nicely $0/1$. Towards this end, let $v=(y^1,\dots,y^k,w)$ be a vertex of Q and let us define

$$x^j := \begin{cases} \frac{1}{w_j} y^j & \text{if } w_j > 0, \\ \mathbb{O} & \text{if } w_j = 0. \end{cases}$$

Note that $x^j \in Q_j$ if $w_j > 0$. Let us recall that $(y^j,0) \in \operatorname{homog}(Q_j)$ if and only if $y^j \in \operatorname{rec}(Q_j)$. Since Q_j is a polytope, we obtain that $(y^j,0) \in \operatorname{homog}(Q_j)$ if and only if $y^j = \mathbb{O}$. Thus, we get

$$w_j x^j = y^j \tag{2}$$

as well as

$$(\tilde{w}_j x^j, \tilde{w}_j) \in \operatorname{homog}(Q_j) \quad \forall\, j \in [k],\ \tilde{w}_j \geq 0. \tag{3}$$

We claim that w is a vertex of Δ_k. If not, then there exist $\overline{w},\underline{w} \in \Delta_k$ with $\overline{w} \neq \underline{w}$ such that $w = \mu\cdot\overline{w} + (1-\mu)\cdot\underline{w}$ for some $\mu \in (0,1)$. By equation (3), we have that $(\overline{w}_j\cdot x^j, \overline{w}_j), (\underline{w}_j\cdot x^j, \underline{w}_j) \in \operatorname{homog}(Q_j)$ holds for all $j \in [k]$ and hence

$$\overline{v} := (\overline{w}_1\cdot x^1,\dots,\overline{w}_k\cdot x^k,\overline{w}) \in Q \quad \text{ and } \quad \underline{v} := (\underline{w}_1\cdot x^1,\dots,\underline{w}_k\cdot x^k,\underline{w}) \in Q.$$

On the other hand, we also have

$$\mu\cdot\overline{w}_j\cdot x^j + (1-\mu)\cdot\underline{w}_j\cdot x^j = w_j x^j \overset{(2)}{=} y^j,$$

a contradiction to v being a vertex of Q.

Since w is a vertex of Δ_k, by relabeling the indices, we may assume that $w_1 = 1$ and $w_j = 0$ for all $j \in \{2,\dots,k\}$. As mentioned above, this implies $y^j = \mathbb{O}$ for all $j \in \{2,\dots,k\}$. We claim that y^1 is a vertex of Q_1. For the sake of a contradiction let us assume that there exist $\overline{y},\underline{y} \in Q_1$ with $\overline{y} \neq \underline{y}$ such that $y^1 = \mu\cdot\overline{y} + (1-\mu)\cdot\underline{y}$ for some $\mu \in (0,1)$. Since $w_1 = 1$, we have that $(\overline{y},w_1),(\underline{y},w_1) \in \operatorname{homog}(Q_1)$ and hence

$$\overline{v} := (\overline{y},\mathbb{O},\dots,\mathbb{O},w) \in Q \quad \text{ and } \quad \underline{v} := (\underline{y},\mathbb{O},\dots,\mathbb{O},w) \in Q.$$

On the other hand, we also have $v = \mu\cdot\overline{v} + (1-\mu)\cdot\underline{v}$, which again is a contradiction to v being a vertex of Q.

Since Q_1 is a $0/1$-polytope, y^1 is also a $0/1$-vector and so is v. Moreover, since (Q_1,π_1) is a nice $0/1$-extension, we obtain that $\pi(v) = \pi_1(y^1)$ is a vertex of P_1 and hence a vertex of $P := \operatorname{conv}\big(\cup_{i=1}^k P_i\big)$. Thus, Q is indeed a $0/1$-polytope and each vertex of Q is projected onto a vertex of P.

In order to verify property (iii), let v be a vertex of P. Since the P_i's are $0/1$-polytopes, there exists an index $\ell \in [k]$ such that v is a vertex of P_ℓ. Further, let $v' = (y^1,\dots,y^k,w)$ be a vertex of Q such that $\pi(v') = v$. We have seen that there exists an index $i \in [k]$ such that y^i is a vertex of Q_i, $w_i = 1$ and $y^j = \mathbb{O}$ for all $j \in [k]\setminus\{i\}$. Since $v = \pi(v') = \pi_i(y^i) \in P_i$ and the P_j's are pairwise disjoint, we obtain that $i = \ell$. Finally, since (Q_i,π_i) is nicely $0/1$, y^i is uniquely determined by v and so is v'. □

Surprisingly, our computations considerably benefit from this simple consequence:

Corollary 2.5. *For any $0/1$-polytope $P \subseteq \mathbb{R}^p$ with $\dim(P) \geq 1$ and any point $v \in \{0,1\}^p \setminus P$, it holds that*

$$\operatorname{xc*}\big(\operatorname{conv}(P \cup \{v\})\big) \leq \operatorname{xc*}(P) + 1. \quad \square$$

Let us remark that the assumption of disjointness in the above statements is only required to satisfy property (iii) of Definition 1.

2.2. **Reflections.** Another general method to construct extended formulations for polytopes P has been introduced by Kaibel and Pashkovich [11]. It is again based on the assumption that P can be written as the convex hull of the union of two polytopes P' and P''. Further, it requires P'' to be very similar to P', namely being the reflection of P' through some hyperplane.

For $a \in \mathbb{R}^p \setminus \{\mathbb{O}\}$ and $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ let $H^{\leq}(a,\beta) := \{x : \langle a, x\rangle \leq \beta\}$ denote the associated halfspace. We further define $H^{=}(a,\beta) := \{x : \langle a, x\rangle = \beta\}$ as the corresponding hyperplane. The reflection $\varphi_H \colon \mathbb{R}^p \to \mathbb{R}^p$ at $H = H^{=}(a,\beta)$ can be written as

$$\varphi_H(x) = x + 2 \cdot \frac{\beta - \langle a, x\rangle}{\|a\|^2} \cdot a.$$

Suppose that $P' \subseteq H^{\leq}(a,\beta)$ and $P'' = \varphi_H(P')$. Although [11] addresses to a slightly more general type of reflection, their results imply the simple extended formulation

$$\operatorname{conv}(P' \cup P'') = \left\{ x + \lambda \cdot \frac{2}{\|a\|^2} \cdot a : x \in P',\, 0 \leq \lambda \leq \beta - \langle a, x\rangle \right\},$$

where replacing P' again by an extension (Q', π') yields

$$\operatorname{conv}(P' \cup P'') = \left\{ \pi'(y) + \lambda \cdot \frac{2}{\|a\|^2} \cdot a : y \in Q',\, 0 \leq \lambda \leq \beta - \langle a, \pi'(y)\rangle \right\}. \tag{4}$$

In terms of a bound on the general extension complexity, we conclude:

Theorem 2.6 ([11])**.** *Let $P' \subseteq \mathbb{R}^p$ and $a \in \mathbb{R}^p \setminus \{\mathbb{O}\}$, $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $P' \subseteq H^{\leq}(a,\beta)$. Then*

$$\operatorname{xc}\Big(\operatorname{conv}\big(P' \cup \varphi_H(P')\big)\Big) \leq \operatorname{xc}(P') + 2.$$

In Section 4, we will make use of two very specific types of reflections: First, for any $i \in [p]$ let $\varphi_{\text{flip},i} \colon \mathbb{R}^p \to \mathbb{R}^p$ be the map that flips the ith entry of vectors $x \in \mathbb{R}^p$, i.e.,

$$\varphi_{\text{flip},i}(x)_\ell := \begin{cases} 1 - x_i & \text{if } \ell = i \\ x_\ell & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

This map coincides with the reflection map φ_H that is induced by setting $\beta = \pm 1$, $a_i = \pm 2$ and $a_\ell = 0$ for all $\ell \in [p] \backslash \{i\}$. Second, for any $i, j \in [p]$ with $i \neq j$ let $\varphi_{\text{swap},i,j} \colon \mathbb{R}^p \to \mathbb{R}^p$ be the map that swaps the ith and jth coordinate of vectors $x \in \mathbb{R}^p$, i.e.,

$$\varphi_{\text{swap},i,j}(x)_\ell := \begin{cases} x_j & \text{if } \ell = i \\ x_i & \text{if } \ell = j \\ x_\ell & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

This is equivalent to the reflection map that is induced by setting $\beta = 0$, $a_i = \pm 1$, $a_j = \mp 1$ and $a_\ell =$ for all $\ell \in [p] \setminus \{i, j\}$.

We say that (a, β) *induces a symmetry of the cube* if it is of one of the above types. Note that in all these cases, for all $v \in \{0,1\}^p$, the expression $\beta - \langle a, v\rangle$ attains only values in $\{0, t\}$ for $t \in \{-1, 1\}$ (t depends on the orientation of the associated halfspace we used). This property allows us to make an analogous statement as in Theorem 2.6 for sizes of nice $0/1$-extensions:

Theorem 2.7. *Let $P' \subseteq \mathbb{R}^p$ be a $0/1$-polytope and let $a \in \mathbb{R}^p, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$ induce a symmetry of the cube with $P' \subseteq H^{\leq}(a,\beta)$. Then*

$$\operatorname{xc}^*\Big(\operatorname{conv}\big(P' \cup \varphi_H(P')\big)\Big) \leq \operatorname{xc}^*(P') + 2.$$

Proof. By the above paragraph, we may assume that $\beta - \langle a, v\rangle \in \{0, 1\}$ holds for all vertices v of P'. Otherwise, replace P' by $\varphi_H(P')$, which is affinely isomorphic and hence $\mathrm{xc}^*(P') = \mathrm{xc}^*(\varphi_H(P'))$.

Let (Q', π') be a nice $0/1$-extension of P'. As mentioned above, the polytope

$$Q = \big\{(y, \lambda) : y \in Q',\, 0 \le \lambda \le \beta - \langle a, \pi'(y)\rangle\big\}$$

together with the map $\pi(y, \lambda) = \pi'(y) + \lambda \cdot \frac{2}{\|a\|^2}$ is an extension for $P := \mathrm{conv}\big(P' \cup \varphi_H(P')\big)$. We have to show that (Q, π) is nicely $0/1$.

Let (y, λ) be a vertex of Q. First, suppose that there exists an $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $0 \le \lambda - \varepsilon \le \lambda \le \lambda + \varepsilon \le \beta - \langle a, \pi'(y)\rangle$. In this case, we can write

$$(y, \lambda) = \frac{1}{2}(y, \lambda - \varepsilon) + \frac{1}{2}(y, \lambda + \varepsilon),$$

a contradiction since $(y, \lambda - \varepsilon), (y, \lambda + \varepsilon) \in Q$ and (y, λ) is assumed to be a vertex of Q. Thus, at least one of the inequalities $0 \le \lambda$ and $\lambda \le \beta - \langle a, \pi'(y)\rangle$ holds with equality.

Second, we show that y is a vertex of Q'. Let us assume that there are vectors $y^1, y^2 \in Q'$ with $y^1 \ne y^2$ such that $y = \mu \cdot y^1 + (1 - \mu) \cdot y^2$ for some $\mu \in (0, 1)$. If $\lambda = 0$, we have that $(y, \lambda) = \mu \cdot (y^1, 0) + (1 - \mu) \cdot (y^2, 0)$ as well as $(y^1, 0), (y^2, 0) \in Q$ since $\pi'(Q') \subseteq H^{\le}(a, \beta)$, a contradiction to (y, λ) being a vertex of Q. If otherwise $\lambda = \beta - \langle a, \pi'(y)\rangle$, let us set $\lambda_i := \beta - \langle a, \pi'(y^i)\rangle \ge 0$ for $i = 1, 2$. By construction, we again have that $(y^1, \lambda_1), (y^2, \lambda_2) \in Q$. Since

$$\begin{aligned}\mu\lambda_1 + (1 - \mu)\lambda_2 &= \mu(\beta - \langle a, \pi'(y^1)\rangle) + (1 - \mu)(\beta - \langle a, \pi'(y^2)\rangle)\\ &= \beta - \langle a, \pi'(y)\rangle = \lambda,\end{aligned}$$

we obtain $(y, \lambda) = \mu \cdot (y^1, \lambda_1) + (1 - \mu) \cdot (y^2, \lambda_1)$ and hence again a contradiction to the assumption that (y, λ) is a vertex of Q.

Since (Q', π') is nicely $0/1$, y is a $0/1$-vector and $v := \pi'(y)$ is a vertex of P'. We have seen that $\lambda \in \{0, \beta - \langle a, v\rangle\}$ holds. By our first assumption, this implies that $\lambda \in \{0, 1\}$ and hence (y, λ) is a $0/1$-vector. Further, we have that

$$\pi(y, \lambda) \in \{\pi(y, 0), \pi(y, \beta - \langle a, v\rangle)\} = \{v, \varphi_H(v)\}$$

and since φ_H is one of the cube's symmetries, $\varphi_H(v)$ is a $0/1$ point and hence a vertex of P and so is $\pi(y, \lambda)$.

It remains to be shown that every vertex v^* of P has a unique preimage. Since again φ_H is one of the cube's symmetries and $P' \subseteq H^{\le}(a, \beta)$, there exists a unique vertex v' of P' such that $v^* = v'$ or $v^* = \varphi_H(v')$. Thus, if (y^*, λ^*) projects onto v^*, we must have $\pi'(y^*) = v'$. Since (Q', π') is nicely $0/1$, y^* is uniquely determined by v' (and hence by v^*). Further, λ^* is also uniquely determined by v^* depending on whether $v^* = v'$ or $v^* = \varphi_H(v')$ holds. Note that if $\varphi_H(v^*) = v^*$, then $\lambda^* = 0$ in both cases. □

Another simple consequence which our computations exploit is the following fact:

Corollary 2.8. *Let $P' \subseteq \mathbb{R}^p$ be a $0/1$-polytope and let $a \in \mathbb{R}^p, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$ induce a symmetry of the cube with $P' \subseteq H^{\le}(a, \beta)$. If $P' \cap H$ is a facet of P', then*

$$\mathrm{xc}^*\Big(\mathrm{conv}\big(P' \cup \varphi_H(P')\big)\Big) \le \#\mathrm{facets}(P') + 1.$$

Proof. Set $k = \#\mathrm{facets}(P')$ and let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{(k-1)\times p}$, $b \in \mathbb{R}^{k-1}$ such that $P' = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^p : Ax \le b,\, \langle a, x\rangle \le \beta\}$. By (the proof of) Theorem 2.7, we have that

$$Q := \{(x, \lambda) : x \in P',\, 0 \le \lambda \le \beta - \langle a, x\rangle\}.$$

is a nice $0/1$-extension (together with $\pi(x,\lambda) = x + \lambda \cdot a$) for $\operatorname{conv}\big(P' \cup \varphi_H(P')\big)$. Since $0 \leq \lambda \leq \beta - \langle a, x\rangle$ implies $\langle a, x\rangle \leq \beta$, we obtain

$$Q = \{(x,\lambda) : Ax \leq b,\, 0 \leq \lambda \leq \beta - \langle a, x\rangle\}$$

and hence Q has at most $(k-1)+2 = k+1$ facets. □

2.3. **Down-Monotonicity.** The third construction that we will use in Section 4 is related to the concept of down-monotone polyhedra. Here, we are only interested in down-monotonicity with respect to only one coordinate. Let us consider the map $\operatorname{down}_j \colon \mathbb{R}^p \to \mathbb{R}^p$ defined via

$$\operatorname{down}_j(x)_i := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } j = k \\ x_i & \text{else,} \end{cases}$$

where $j \in [p]$. For a polyhedron $P' \subseteq \mathbb{R}^p_+$, it is straightforward to see that

$$\operatorname{conv}\big(P' \cup \operatorname{down}_j(P')\big) = \big\{z \in \mathbb{R}^p : x \in P',\, 0 \leq z_j \leq x_j,\, z_i = x_i \,\forall\, i \in [p] \setminus \{j\}\big\}$$

holds, which immediatly yields the bound

$$\operatorname{xc}\Big(\operatorname{conv}\big(P' \cup \operatorname{down}_j(P')\big)\Big) \leq \operatorname{xc}(P') + 2.$$

In terms of nice $0/1$-extensions we need an additional requirement on P':

Theorem 2.9. *Let P' be a $0/1$-polytope such that down_j is injective on the vertices of P'. Then*

$$\operatorname{xc}^*\Big(\operatorname{conv}\big(P' \cup \operatorname{down}_j(P')\big)\Big) \leq \operatorname{xc}^*(P') + 2.$$

Proof. Let (Q', π') be a nice $0/1$-extension of P' and consider the polytope

$$Q := \{(y,\lambda) : y \in Q',\, 0 \leq \lambda \leq \pi'(y)_j\}$$

together with the linear map

$$\pi(y,\lambda) := \operatorname{down}_j(\pi'(y)) + \mathbb{e}_j \cdot \lambda,$$

where $\mathbb{e}_j$ is the jth unit vector. As mentioned above, (Q,π) is an extension for $P := \operatorname{conv}(P' \cup \operatorname{down}_j(P'))$. Let (y,λ) be a vertex of Q. Analogous to the proof of Theorem 2.7, it is easy to see that y is a vertex of Q' and $\lambda \in \{0, \pi'(y)_j\} \subseteq \{0,1\}$. This directly implies that Q is a $0/1$-polytope and that every vertex of Q is projected onto a vertex of P. Finally, the uniqueness of preimages of vertices of P follows from the fact that down_j is injective on the vertices of P' and that (Q', π') be a nice $0/1$-extension of P'. □

3. Combinatorial Lower Bounds

In this section, we review known combinatorial lower bounds on the extension complexities of polytopes. We present a slight refinement of the rectangle covering bound, for which, in the case of 4-dimensional $0/1$-polytopes, the resulting bound (i) is still easy to compute and (ii) provides tight results. Before, let us consider the following very simple bounds on the extension complexity:

Proposition 3.1. *For any polytope P with $\dim(P) = d$ it holds that*

a) $\operatorname{xc}(P) \geq d+1$,
b) $\operatorname{xc}(P) = d+1$ *if and only if P is a simplex,*
c) $\operatorname{xc}(P) = d+2$ *if and only if* $\min\{\#\text{facets}(P), \#\text{vertices}(P)\} = d+2$.

Proof. Let (Q, π) be a minimum size extension for P. By Lemma 2.3, we may assume that Q is a polytope. Parts a) and b) are left to the reader. By Proposition 2.1 it remains to show the only-if part of c).

Suppose that $\#\text{facets}(P), \#\text{vertices}(P) \geq d+3$ and let us assume that Q has at most $d+2$ facets. Note that $\dim(Q) \geq d+1$ since otherwise Q is isomorphic to P and hence has at least $d+3$ facets. This implies that Q is a $(d+1)$-simplex and hence has only $d+2$ vertices. Since Q must have at least as many vertices as P, we obtain a contradiction. □

It turns out that, together with constructions from Section 2, the above bounds suffice to determine the extension complexities of all $0/1$-polytopes up to dimension 3 (see Section 4). Not surprisingly, one needs more profound bounds for tight results in dimension 4.

3.1. **Yannakakis' Theorem.** In his seminal paper [15], Yannakakis gave an algebraic interpretation of the extension complexity and laid the foundation of the developtment of bounds used in important theoretical results as in [6] or [14].

Let $P = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^p : Ax \leq b\}$ be a polytope with $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times p}$, $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and $\{v^1, \dots, v^k\}$ the set of its vertices. The nonnegative matrix $S \in \mathbb{R}_+^{m \times k}$ defined via

$$S_{i,j} := b_i - \langle A_{i,*}, v^j \rangle,$$

where $A_{i,*}$ denotes the ith row of A, is called a *slack matrix* of P. Further, the smallest number r such that $S = U \cdot V$ for two nonnegative matrices $U \in \mathbb{R}_+^{m \times r}$, $V \in \mathbb{R}_+^{r \times k}$ is called the *nonnegative rank* of S and denoted by $r_+(S)$.

Theorem 3.2 (Yannakakis '91)**.** *Let P be a polytope and S be a slack matrix of P. Then* $\text{xc}(P) = r_+(S)$.

The nonnegative rank of a matrix S can also be seen as the smallest r such that S can be written as the sum of r nonnegative rank-1 matrices, which is a helpful interpretation to obtain combinatorial bounds.

3.2. **Rectangle Coverings and Fooling Sets.** A well-known bound on the nonnegative rank is the *rectangle covering bound*, which we will present here. For more details, in particular related to its application in the field of extended formulations, we refer to the paper of Fiorini et al. [5].

Let S be a slack matrix whose rows and columns are indexed by some sets $\mathcal{I}$ and $\mathcal{J}$, respectively. Let us define the *support* of S as the set $\text{supp}(S) := \{(i,j) \in \mathcal{I} \times \mathcal{J} : S_{i,j} > 0\}$. A set $I \times J$ with $I \subseteq \mathcal{I}$, $J \subseteq \mathcal{J}$ is now called a *rectangle*, if $I \times J \subseteq \text{supp}(S)$. Further, a set of rectangles $R_1, \dots, R_k$ is called a *rectangle covering* if $\text{supp}(S) = \cup_{\ell=1}^k R_\ell$. The following observation motivates to consider the so-called *rectangle covering number* of S, which is denoted by $\text{rc}(S)$ and defined as the smallest number of rectangles in any rectangle covering of S. Suppose that the nonnegative rank of S is r, i.e., there exist nonnegative matrices $\mathcal{R}^1, \dots, \mathcal{R}^r$ such that $S = \sum_{\ell=1}^r \mathcal{R}^\ell$. Then the sets $R_\ell := \text{supp}(\mathcal{R}_\ell)$ are clearly rectangles. Moreover, one has that

$$\text{supp}(S) = \text{supp}(\cup_{\ell=1}^r \mathcal{R}_\ell) = \cup_{\ell=1}^r \text{supp}(\mathcal{R}_\ell) = \cup_{\ell=1}^r R_\ell,$$

and hence the R_ℓ's form a rectangle covering of S. Thus, if P is a polytope and S a slack matrix of P, we obtain the rectangle covering bound

$$\text{rc}(S) \leq r_+(S) = \text{xc}(P).$$

Since it still seems to be a difficult task to determine (or compute) $\text{rc}(S)$, one is of course interested in further lower bounds that are easier to compute. One simple bound on the

rectangle covering number is the *fooling set bound*, where a *fooling set* is a set $F \subseteq \operatorname{supp}(S)$ such that

$$S_{i_1,j_2} = 0 \text{ or } S_{i_2,j_1} = 0$$

holds for all distinct pairs $(i_1, j_1), (i_2, j_2) \in F$. In what follows, the largest cardinality of a fooling set of S is called the *fooling set number* and will be denoted by $\omega(S)$. It is easy to see that any rectangle of S can contain at most one element of F. Thus, any rectangle covering of S consists of at least $|F|$ rectangles and hence we obtain

$$\omega(S) \leq \operatorname{rc}(S).$$

In summary:

Proposition 3.3. *Let P be a polytope and S a slack matrix of P. Then*

$$\omega(S) \leq \operatorname{rc}(S) \leq r_+(S) = \operatorname{xc}(P).$$

While it is not much known about the general performance of the rectangle covering bound, there are some definite limitations. For instance, it is a classical fact that $\omega(S) \leq (\dim(P) + 1)^2$, see, e.g., [5]. Of course, in the case of $0/1$-polytopes of dimension 4, this limitation is trivial since such polytopes have at most 16 vertices and hence an extension complexity of at most 16. In fact, it turns out that the fooling set bound already yields tight bounds in many of our computations.

3.3. **Refinined Rectangle Coverings.** Although the classical lower bounds perform surprisingly well on slack matrices of $0/1$-polytopes of dimension 4, there are still some polytopes for which there is a gap between the rectangle covering number and the extension complexity. One drawback of the rectangle covering number is that it only depends on the sparsity pattern of the considered matrix. In general, a rectangle covering $R_1, \ldots, R_k$ of a nonnegative matrix S might be far away from being induced by nonnegative rank-1 matrices $\mathcal{R}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{R}_k$ such that $S = \sum_{\ell=1}^{k} \mathcal{R}_\ell$. For instance, the matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

has rectangle covering number 1 while its nonnegative rank is 2. Thus, in order to assure that a rectangle covering is at least locally (by only considering 2×2-submatrices) extendable to a rank-1 decomposition, we propose the following additional requirement:

Definition 2. A rectangle covering $R_1, \ldots, R_k$ of a nonnegative matrix S is called a *refined covering* if

$$\left| \left\{ \ell : R_\ell \cap \{(i_1, j_1), (i_2, j_2)\} \neq \emptyset \right\} \right| \geq 2$$

holds for all pairs $(i_1, j_1), (i_2, j_2)$ with $S_{i_1,j_1} \cdot S_{i_2,j_2} > S_{i_1,j_2} \cdot S_{i_1,j_2}$. The smallest size of any refined covering of S is called the *refined rectangle covering number* and denoted by $\operatorname{rrc}(S)$.

It turns out that this quantity allows us to close all remaining gaps in our computations in Section 4.

Theorem 3.4. *Let S be a nonnegative matrix. Then*

$$\operatorname{rc}(S) \leq \operatorname{rrc}(S) \leq r_+(S).$$

Proof. Suppose that there exist nonnegative rank-1 matrices $\mathcal{R}_1, \dots, \mathcal{R}_k$ such that

$$S = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \mathcal{R}_i. \tag{5}$$

We have already seen that $\operatorname{supp}(\mathcal{R}_1), \dots, \operatorname{supp}(\mathcal{R})_k$ is a rectangle covering of S. It suffices to show that this covering also satisfies the requirements of Definition 2. Let us assume the contrary. By reordering the rows and columns of S, we may assume that

$$S_{1,1} \cdot S_{2,2} > S_{1,2} \cdot S_{2,1} \tag{6}$$

and let $j \in [k]$ such that $\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{R}_j$ is the only matrix among the $\mathcal{R}_i$'s whose support has a non-empty intersection with $\{(1,1),(2,2)\}$. By equation (5), this implies that

$$\mathcal{R}_{1,1} = S_{1,1} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{R}_{2,2} = S_{2,2}. \tag{7}$$

Since $\mathcal{R}$ has rank 1, we further have that

$$\mathcal{R}_{1,1} \cdot \mathcal{R}_{2,2} = \mathcal{R}_{1,2} \cdot \mathcal{R}_{2,1}. \tag{8}$$

By the nonnegativity of all $\mathcal{R}_i$'s, we finally obtain

$$S_{1,2} \cdot S_{2,1} \geq \mathcal{R}_{1,2} \cdot \mathcal{R}_{2,1} \overset{(8)}{=} \mathcal{R}_{1,1} \cdot \mathcal{R}_{2,2} \overset{(7)}{=} S_{1,1} \cdot S_{2,2} \overset{(6)}{>} S_{1,2} \cdot S_{2,1},$$

a contradiction. □

4. Computation & Results

In this section, we briefly describe our approach of computing the extension complexities of all $0/1$-polytopes up to dimension 4 and present the results. In order to provide comprehensible results, we assign an ID to each polytope. For this purpose, let us define the function $b\colon \{0,1\}^n \to \{0,\dots,2^n-1\}$ via $b(v) := \sum_{i=1}^{n} v_i 2^{i-1}$. For a set $V \subseteq \{0,1\}^n$ of binary vectors, the ID of the corresponding polytope $P = \operatorname{conv}(V)$ is now defined as

$$\operatorname{ID}(P) := \sum_{v \in V} b(v) 2^{b(v)} \in \{0, 2^{2^n} - 1\}.$$

Since the extension complexity of a polytope (as well as our notion of $\operatorname{xc}^*(\cdot)$) is invariant under affine transformations, we shall divide all $0/1$-polytopes in affine equivalence classes. The representative of each equivalence class is chosen to be the polytope with smallest ID inside the class.

In order to compute the affine equivalence classes, we first enumerated all $0/1$-equivalence classes as proposed in [1]. Recall that two $0/1$-polytopes $P, P' \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ are $0/1$-equivalent if there exists an affine isomorphism $f\colon \{0,1\}^n \to \{0,1\}^n$ with $f(\{0,1\}^n) = \{0,1\}^n$ such that $f(P) = P'$. After computing the f-vectors of the representatives of each $0/1$-equivalence class via `polymake`, it remained to run a small number of tests for affine equivalence. See Table 1 for the intermediate results.

Before we restrict ourselves to 4-dimensional $0/1$-polytopes, let us show that no further (computer aided) computations are needed to determine the extension complexities of $0/1$-polytopes of dimension up to 3.

vertices	polytopes	$0/1$-equivalence classes	affine equiv. classes
5	3008	17	1
6	7408	40	8
7	11280	54	17
8	12850	72	36
9	11440	56	40
10	8008	50	43
11	4368	27	26
12	1820	19	19
13	560	6	6
14	120	4	4
15	16	1	1
16	1	1	1
$\sum$	60879	347	202

TABLE 1. Number of 4-dimensional $0/1$-polytopes



FIGURE 1. All $0/1$-polytopes up to dimension 3 (IDs in parentheses)

4.1. **Computations Up to Dimension 3.** With respect to affine equivalence, there are 12 different $0/1$-polytopes of dimension 3 or less, see Figure 1. Applying Proposition 3.1 already yields that in each of the cases, except for the *sliced cube* (ID 127), the trivial extensions of Proposition 2.1 are smallest possible. Considering the sliced cube, observe that it can be written as the convex hull of the union of the prism and a single point. Since the prism has 5 facets, we obtain an extension with only 6 facets by Corollary 2.5. Again by Proposition 3.1, this has smallest possible size. Note that all minimum size extensions used here are nice $0/1$-extensions. A summary of the results can be found in Table 2.

polytope	ID	dimension	vertices	facets	xc*
point	1	0	1	0	0
interval	3	1	2	2	2
triangle	7	2	3	3	3
square	15	2	4	4	4
tetrahedron	23	3	4	4	4
pyramid	31	3	5	5	5
bipyramid	107	3	5	6	5
prism	63	3	6	5	5
nameless	111	3	6	7	6
octahedron	126	3	6	8	6
sliced cube	127	3	7	7	6
cube	255	3	8	6	6

TABLE 2. Extension complexities of representatives of all affine equivalence classes of $0/1$-polytopes up to dimension 3

4.2. **Computations in Dimension 4.** In Section 3, we presented several lower bounds on the extension complexity. Let us recall, that we have the inequality chain

$$\omega(S) \leq \mathrm{rc}(S) \leq \mathrm{rrc}(S) \leq r_+(S) = \mathrm{xc}(P) \leq \mathrm{xc}^*(P),$$

where S is the slack matrix of the polytope P. For each representative of all affine equivalence classes, we computed their slack matrices with `polymake` and calculated all required lower bounds by using simple, exact backtracking algorithms.

In order to obtain tight upper bounds on $\mathrm{xc}(P)$, we first fixed all representatives for which the trivial extension of Proposition 2.1 is already of minimum size. Observe now that all upper bounds in Section 2 are induced by extensions constructed in the following way: Start with a polytope P' and perform a simple geometric operation to obtain P. If the size of the resulting extension matches the largest lower bound on $\mathrm{xc}(P)$, then the extension complexity of P is determined. In that case, we call the polytope P' the *predecessor polytope* of P. By iterating this process of checking for appropriate predecessors and geometric operations that yield smallest possible extensions, we were able to determine the extension complexities of all representatives. Note that these computations can also be performed by very simple algorithms.

The final results are presented in Table 3 and can be read as follows: For each representative P, we list its ID, its number of vertices (n) and facets (m) as well as all computed lower bounds on $\mathrm{xc}(P)$ as well as $\mathrm{xc}(P)$ itself. Since all implicitly computed extensions are even nice $0/1$-extensions, we have that $\mathrm{xc}(P)$ and $\mathrm{xc}^*(P)$ conincide in all these cases. Further, we indicate the geometric operation used to construct the smallest extension as well as the corresponding predecessor polytope. For the geometric operations, we use the

following symbols:

- - no operation, original outer description is smallest possible
- Δ trivial vertex-extension (see Proposition 2.1)
- $\cup$ union with a single point (see Corollary 2.5)
- $\div$ reflection at a hyperplane corresponding to one of the cube's symmetries (see Theorem 2.7)
- $\div^*$ reflection at a hyperplane corresponding to one of the cube's symmetries that is also a facet of the predecessor polytope (see Corollary 2.8)
- $\downarrow$ making the predecessor down-monotone with respect to one coordinate (see 2.9)

Finally, since it may be too time-consuming for the reader to compute the affine equivalence class of a given polytope P, we additionaly provide the representatives of all $0/1$-equivalence classes that fall into the same affine equivalence class as P. Thus, the reader has only to compute (the representative of) the $0/1$-equivalence class of P. Note that this can be done very efficiently since any affine map of the cube is a composition of some entry flips and coordinate swaps defined in Section 2.2, see [1].

ID	n	m	ω	rc	rrc	xc*	extension	predecessor	further representatives
279	5	5	5	5	5	5	-	-	283, 286, 301, 361, 362, 391, 395, 406, 410, 425, 428, 488, 856, 872, 1681, 5761
287	6	6	6	6	6	6	-	-	303, 317, 318, 366, 399, 411, 427, 429, 430, 444, 490, 858, 876, 965, 966, 980, 984, 1635, 1641, 1650, 1656, 1686, 5766
363	6	7	6	6	6	6	Δ	-	407, 414, 489, 1713, 1714, 1716
5769	6	8	6	6	6	6	Δ	-	-
5784	6	8	6	6	6	6	Δ	-	-
6017	6	8	6	6	6	6	Δ	-	-
854	6	9	6	6	6	6	Δ	-	857, 874
873	6	9	6	6	6	6	Δ	-	1683
5763	6	9	6	6	6	6	Δ	-	-
319	7	6	6	6	6	6	-	-	431, 494, 829, 892, 967, 988, 1639, 1654, 1912, 5782
1643	7	7	7	7	7	7	-	-	1718
367	7	8	7	7	7	7	Δ	-	415, 446, 491, 1777, 1778, 1969, 1972
855	7	8	7	7	7	7	Δ	-	859, 862, 878, 981, 985, 1651, 1658
382	7	9	7	7	7	7	Δ	-	445, 2017, 2018, 5737, 5738
875	7	9	7	7	7	7	Δ	-	877, 982, 1715, 1717
1657	7	9	7	7	7	7	Δ	-	1687, 1721
5774	7	10	7	7	7	7	Δ	-	-
5785	7	10	7	7	7	7	Δ	-	-
5786	7	10	7	7	7	7	Δ	-	-
6019	7	10	7	7	7	7	Δ	-	-
6025	7	10	7	7	7	7	Δ	-	-
5767	7	11	7	7	7	7	Δ	-	-
5771	7	11	7	7	7	7	Δ	-	-

continued on next page

continued from previous page

ID	n	m	ω	rc	rrc	xc*	extension	predecessor	further representatives
5801	7	12	7	7	7	7	Δ	-	-
5804	7	12	7	7	7	7	Δ	-	6040
6625	7	13	7	7	7	7	Δ	-	-
831	8	6	6	6	6	6	-	-	975, 1020, 15555
863	8	7	7	7	7	7	-	-	989, 1655, 1910, 1914
383	8	8	7	7	7	7	$\cup$	$375\ (\cong 319)$	447, 495, 510, 2033, 2034, 2040
893	8	8	7	7	7	7	$\cup$	$892\ (\cong 319)$	983, 1973
1647	8	8	7	7	7	7	$\cup$	$1646\ (\cong 319)$	1782
1723	8	8	7	7	7	7	$\cup$	$1211\ (\cong 319)$	1913
879	8	9	7	7	7	7	$\cup$	$847\ (\cong 319)$	990, 1779, 1971, 1980
894	8	9	7	7	7	7	$\cup$	$892\ (\cong 319)$	987, 1662, 2019, 2022, 5742
1659	8	9	8	8	8	8	Δ	-	1719, 1974
5739	8	9	8	8	8	8	Δ	-	-
5783	8	9	7	7	7	7	$\cup$	$5782\ (\cong 319)$	-
5790	8	9	7	7	7	7	$\cup$	$5782\ (\cong 319)$	-
6038	8	10	7	7	7	7	$\cup$	$5910\ (\cong 319)$	-
6041	8	10	7	7	7	7	$\cup$	$5529\ (\cong 319)$	-
1695	8	11	8	8	8	8	Δ	-	1785
1725	8	11	8	8	8	8	Δ	-	2025
5787	8	11	8	8	8	8	Δ	-	-
5803	8	11	8	8	8	8	Δ	-	-
6023	8	11	7	7	7	7	$\cup$	$5895\ (\cong 319)$	-
6630	8	11	7	7	7	7	$\cup$	$6502\ (\cong 319)$	-
5806	8	12	8	8	8	8	Δ	-	6042
5820	8	12	7	7	7	7	$\cup$	$5692\ (\cong 319)$	6634
6027	8	12	8	8	8	8	Δ	-	-
6641	8	12	8	8	8	8	Δ	-	-
7140	8	12	8	8	8	8	Δ	-	-
7905	8	12	7	7	7	7	$\cup$	$7904\ (\cong 319)$	-
5775	8	13	8	8	8	8	Δ	-	-
5805	8	13	8	8	8	8	Δ	-	-
6030	8	13	8	8	8	8	Δ	-	-
6057	8	13	8	8	8	8	Δ	-	-
6627	8	13	8	8	8	8	Δ	-	-
6633	8	13	8	8	8	8	Δ	-	-
5866	8	14	8	8	8	8	Δ	-	6060, 6648
5865	8	15	8	8	8	8	Δ	-	-
6375	8	15	8	8	8	8	Δ	-	-
6120	8	16	8	8	8	8	Δ	-	7128, 27030
1911	9	6	6	6	6	6	-	-	-
511	9	7	7	7	7	7	-	-	4081
895	9	8	7	7	7	7	$\cup$	$831\ (\cong 831)$	991, 1021, 2035, 2042
1915	9	8	7	8	8	8	-	-	1975
1663	9	9	8	8	8	8	$\cup$	$1662\ (\cong 894)$	1783, 2038
1918	9	9	7	8	8	8	$\cup$	$1916\ (\cong 863)$	2023, 5758
5743	9	9	8	8	8	8	$\cup$	$5742\ (\cong 894)$	-

continued on next page

continued from previous page

ID	n	m	ω	rc	rrc	xc*	extension	predecessor	further representatives
6039	9	9	7	7	7	7	$\cup$	5911 ($\cong$ 831)	-
15559	9	9	7	7	7	7	$\cup$	15555 ($\cong$ 831)	-
1727	9	10	8	8	8	8	$\cup$	1723 ($\cong$ 1723)	1787, 2041
1981	9	10	8	8	8	8	$\cup$	1980 ($\cong$ 879)	2027
6638	9	10	7	7	7	7	$\cup$	4590 ($\cong$ 831)	-
5791	9	11	8	8	8	8	$\cup$	5790 ($\cong$ 5790)	-
5822	9	11	8	8	8	8	$\cup$	5820 ($\cong$ 5820)	-
6043	9	11	8	8	8	8	$\cup$	6041 ($\cong$ 6041)	-
7921	9	11	8	8	8	8	$\cup$	7920 ($\cong$ 383)	-
5807	9	12	8	8	8	8	$\cup$	5295 ($\cong$ 879)	-
6046	9	12	8	8	8	8	$\cup$	6038 ($\cong$ 6038)	-
6059	9	12	8	8	8	8	$\cup$	6058 ($\cong$ 383)	-
6643	9	12	8	8	8	8	$\cup$	6579 ($\cong$ 879)	-
6649	9	12	8	8	8	8	$\cup$	6617 ($\cong$ 383)	-
7141	9	12	8	8	8	8	$\cup$	7077 ($\cong$ 5790)	-
7148	9	12	8	8	8	8	$\cup$	7116 ($\cong$ 383)	-
7907	9	12	8	8	8	8	$\cup$	7906 ($\cong$ 5820)	-
5821	9	13	8	8	8	8	$\cup$	5820 ($\cong$ 5820)	-
5870	9	13	8	8	8	8	$\cup$	5862 ($\cong$ 5820)	6076, 6650
6031	9	13	8	8	8	8	$\cup$	6023 ($\cong$ 6023)	-
6061	9	13	8	8	8	8	$\cup$	6053 ($\cong$ 6041)	-
6062	9	13	8	8	8	8	$\cup$	6058 ($\cong$ 383)	-
6631	9	13	8	8	8	8	$\cup$	6630 ($\cong$ 6630)	-
6635	9	13	8	8	8	8	$\cup$	6634 ($\cong$ 5820)	-
6646	9	13	8	8	8	8	$\cup$	6630 ($\cong$ 6630)	-
7910	9	13	8	8	8	8	$\cup$	7908 ($\cong$ 5820)	-
5867	9	14	8	9	9	9	Δ	-	-
6122	9	14	8	8	8	8	$\cup$	6058 ($\cong$ 383)	7129
6383	9	14	8	8	8	8	$\cup$	6382 ($\cong$ 6023)	-
7126	9	14	9	9	9	9	Δ	-	-
7913	9	14	8	8	8	8	$\cup$	7912 ($\cong$ 894)	-
6121	9	15	8	9	9	9	Δ	-	-
27031	9	15	8	9	9	9	Δ	-	-
1023	10	7	7	7	7	7	-	-	4083
1919	10	8	7	7	7	7	$\cup$	1911 ($\cong$ 1911)	2039
15567	10	8	7	7	7	7	$\div$	5189 ($\cong$ 107)	-
1791	10	9	8	8	8	8	$\cup$	1279 ($\cong$ 511)	4086
1983	10	9	8	8	8	8	$\cup$	1967 ($\cong$ 895)	2043
2031	10	9	8	8	8	8	$\cup$	1999 ($\cong$ 895)	2046
5759	10	9	8	9	9	9	-	-	-
6014	10	10	7	9	9	9	$\cup$	6012 ($\cong$ 1918)	-
8177	10	10	8	8	8	8	$\cup$	8176 ($\cong$ 511)	-
6047	10	11	8	8	8	8	$\cup$	6039 ($\cong$ 6039)	-
7150	10	11	8	8	8	8	$\cup$	6638 ($\cong$ 6638)	-
7923	10	11	8	8	8	8	$\cup$	7411 ($\cong$ 6638)	-
8178	10	11	8	8	8	8	$\cup$	8176 ($\cong$ 511)	-

continued on next page

continued from previous page

ID	n	m	ω	rc	rrc	xc*	extension	predecessor	further representatives
15575	10	11	8	8	8	8	$\cup$	15571 ($\cong$ 15559)	-
15579	10	11	8	8	8	8	$\cup$	15571 ($\cong$ 15559)	-
5823	10	12	8	9	9	9	$\cup$	5822 ($\cong$ 5822)	-
5886	10	12	8	9	9	9	$\cup$	5884 ($\cong$ 5870)	-
6063	10	12	8	8	8	8	$\cup$	5551 ($\cong$ 895)	-
6639	10	12	8	8	8	8	$\cup$	6638 ($\cong$ 6638)	-
6647	10	12	8	8	8	8	$\cup$	6519 ($\cong$ 6039)	-
6651	10	12	8	8	8	8	$\cup$	6587 ($\cong$ 895)	-
6654	10	12	8	8	8	8	$\cup$	6638 ($\cong$ 6638)	-
7164	10	12	8	8	8	8	$\cup$	5116 ($\cong$ 895)	7930
7918	10	12	7	7	7	7	$\cup$	3822 ($\cong$ 1911)	-
7926	10	12	8	9	9	9	$\cup$	7924 ($\cong$ 7148)	-
8184	10	12	8	8	8	8	$\cup$	8176 ($\cong$ 511)	-
15834	10	12	8	9	9	9	$\cup$	15832 ($\cong$ 5870)	-
5871	10	13	8	9	9	9	$\cup$	5870 ($\cong$ 5870)	-
6077	10	13	8	9	9	9	$\cup$	6076 ($\cong$ 5870)	-
6078	10	13	8	9	9	9	$\cup$	6076 ($\cong$ 5870)	-
6126	10	13	8	8	8	8	$\cup$	5614 ($\cong$ 895)	7131
6399	10	13	8	8	8	8	$\cup$	4351 ($\cong$ 511)	-
7127	10	13	8	9	9	9	$\cup$	7125 ($\cong$ 5870)	-
7134	10	13	9	9	9	9	$\cup$	7132 ($\cong$ 6122)	-
7143	10	13	8	9	9	9	$\cup$	7142 ($\cong$ 7141)	-
7149	10	13	8	9	9	9	$\cup$	7148 ($\cong$ 7148)	-
7911	10	13	8	9	9	9	$\cup$	7910 ($\cong$ 7910)	-
7915	10	13	8	9	9	9	$\cup$	7914 ($\cong$ 5870)	-
7929	10	13	8	9	9	9	$\cup$	7928 ($\cong$ 6122)	-
15830	10	13	8	9	9	9	$\cup$	15828 ($\cong$ 1918)	-
6123	10	14	8	9	9	9	$\cup$	6122 ($\cong$ 6122)	-
27039	10	14	8	9	9	9	$\cup$	27037 ($\cong$ 7913)	-
27606	10	14	8	9	10	10	Δ	-	-
2047	11	8	8	8	8	8	-	-	4087
6015	11	9	8	8	8	8	$\cup$	6007 ($\cong$ 1919)	-
8179	11	10	8	8	8	8	$\cup$	4083 ($\cong$ 1023)	-
15583	11	10	8	8	8	8	$\cup$	15567 ($\cong$ 15567)	-
6655	11	11	8	8	8	8	$\cup$	4607 ($\cong$ 1023)	-
7934	11	11	8	8	8	8	$\cup$	7918 ($\cong$ 7918)	-
8186	11	11	8	8	8	8	$\cup$	4090 ($\cong$ 1023)	-
15853	11	11	8	9	9	9	$\cup$	15852 ($\cong$ 7164)	-
5887	11	12	8	9	9	9	$\cup$	5375 ($\cong$ 1791)	-
6079	11	12	8	8	8	8	$\cup$	5951 ($\cong$ 1919)	-
7135	11	12	8	8	8	8	$\cup$	7007 ($\cong$ 1919)	-
7151	11	12	8	9	9	9	$\cup$	7150 ($\cong$ 7150)	-
7165	11	12	8	9	9	9	$\cup$	7164 ($\cong$ 7164)	-
7919	11	12	8	8	8	8	$\cup$	7918 ($\cong$ 7918)	-
7927	11	12	8	9	9	9	$\cup$	7925 ($\cong$ 7923)	-
7931	11	12	8	9	9	9	$\cup$	7930 ($\cong$ 7164)	-

continued on next page

continued from previous page

ID	n	m	ω	rc	rrc	xc*	extension	predecessor	further representatives
8182	11	12	8	9	9	9	$\cup$	8180 ($\cong$ 8178)	-
8185	11	12	8	9	9	9	$\cup$	8184 ($\cong$ 8184)	-
15831	11	12	8	9	9	9	$\cup$	15827 ($\cong$ 15575)	-
15835	11	12	8	9	9	9	$\cup$	15827 ($\cong$ 15575)	-
15838	11	12	8	9	9	9	$\cup$	15836 ($\cong$ 6126)	-
6127	11	13	8	9	9	9	$\cup$	6126 ($\cong$ 6126)	-
6142	11	13	8	9	9	9	$\cup$	6140 ($\cong$ 6126)	-
27071	11	13	8	9	10	10	$\cup$	27070 ($\cong$ 27039)	-
27581	11	13	8	10	10	10	$\cup$	27580 ($\cong$ 15830)	-
27607	11	13	8	9	10	10	$\cup$	27605 ($\cong$ 7929)	-
4095	12	7	7	7	7	7	-	-	-
15615	12	9	8	8	8	8	$\div$	5205 ($\cong$ 111)	-
15869	12	10	8	8	8	8	$\div^*$	12785 ($\cong$ 863)	-
16380	12	10	8	8	8	8	$\div$	5460 ($\cong$ 126)	-
7167	12	11	8	8	8	8	$\downarrow$	6604 ($\cong$ 319)	-
7935	12	11	8	9	9	9	$\cup$	7934 ($\cong$ 7934)	-
8183	12	11	8	9	9	9	$\cup$	8181 ($\cong$ 8179)	-
8187	12	11	8	9	9	9	$\cup$	8186 ($\cong$ 8186)	-
8190	12	11	8	9	9	9	$\cup$	8188 ($\cong$ 8186)	-
15839	12	11	8	9	9	9	$\cup$	15837 ($\cong$ 7934)	-
15855	12	11	8	9	9	9	$\cup$	15823 ($\cong$ 15583)	-
15870	12	11	8	9	9	9	$\cup$	15868 ($\cong$ 8186)	-
6143	12	12	8	9	9	9	$\cup$	6135 ($\cong$ 6079)	-
27135	12	12	8	9	9	9	$\div^*$	27135 ($\cong$ 27135)	-
27583	12	12	8	9	9	9	$\cup$	27579 ($\cong$ 7919)	-
27615	12	12	8	9	10	10	$\cup$	27613 ($\cong$ 15838)	-
27645	12	12	8	10	10	10	$\cup$	27644 ($\cong$ 15838)	-
28662	12	12	8	9	9	9	$\div$	19924 ($\cong$ 1647)	-
28665	12	12	8	10	10	10	$\cup$	28664 ($\cong$ 8182)	-
8191	13	10	8	8	8	8	$\cup$	4095 ($\cong$ 4095)	-
15871	13	10	8	9	9	9	$\div$	12787 ($\cong$ 895)	-
16381	13	10	8	9	9	9	$\div$	13297 ($\cong$ 895)	-
27647	13	11	8	9	10	10	$\cup$	27643 ($\cong$ 15839)	-
28663	13	11	8	9	10	10	$\cup$	28661 ($\cong$ 15870)	-
28667	13	11	8	10	10	10	$\cup$	28666 ($\cong$ 15870)	-
16383	14	9	8	8	8	8	$\div$	5461 ($\cong$ 127)	-
28671	14	10	8	9	9	9	$\cup$	20479 ($\cong$ 8191)	-
32511	14	10	8	10	10	10	-	-	-
32766	14	10	8	9	10	10	-	-	-
32767	15	9	8	9	9	9	-	-	-
65535	16	8	8	8	8	8	-	-	-

TABLE 3. Extension complexities of representatives of all affine equivalence classes of 4-dimensional $0/1$-polytopes

5. OUTLOOK

We computed the extension complexities of all $0/1$-polytopes up to dimension 4 by providing minimum size extensions and matching lower bounds. In particular, all implicitly computed minimum size extensions were induced by simple geometric operations and satisfy strong properties:

Observation. *For every $0/1$-polytope of dimension at most 4 there exists a minimum size extension that is even a nice $0/1$-extension.*

As mentioned throughout this paper, the authors are not aware of any arguments that rule out the existence of such extensions for general $0/1$-polytopes. On the other hand, there is no theoretical evidence that minimum size extensions with such strong properties should always exist. Thus, any new insights regarding such properties of minimum size extensions are of certain interest.

On the computational side, as a next natural step one might consider computations in dimension 5. However, it seems to be a much more difficult task to achieve a complete list of results in this case. There are $1{,}226{,}525$ different $0/1$-equivalence classes [1]. Thus, even the determination of all affine equivalence classes is presumably very time-consuming. Independently, due to the sizes of the corresponding slack matrices, computing all lower bounds presented in this paper requires sophisticated algorithms. In addition, it is questionable whether rather simple (lower and upper) bounds as presented in this paper suffice to determine all extension complexities.

In this paper we considered the *linear* extension complexity of a polytope P, which can also be seen as the smallest r such that P can be written as a linear projection of an affine slice of the nonnegative orthant $\mathbb{R}^r_+$. A more general way of representing polytopes that recently has become of particular interest is the concept of semidefinite extensions. Here, the analogous quantity is the so-called *semidefinite* extension complexity, which is defined as the smallest r such that P can be written as a linear projection of an affine slice of the cone $\mathbb{S}^r_+$ of positive semidefinite matrices of size $r \times r$. Although there are already several papers concerning this quantity, the field lacks of good upper and lower bounds on sizes of semidefinite extensions. For instance, Gouveia et al. [9] examine properties of polytopes P whose semidefinite extension complexity equals $\dim(P) + 1$ (which is a general lower bound [12]). Using their observations together with our results in Table 2 and the basic construction of semidefinite extensions by taking the positive Hadamard square root of a slack matrix (see [9]), it is easy to determine the semidefinite extension complexities of all $0/1$-polytopes up to dimension 3. However, in order to continue the computations for dimension 4, it seems that new – yet unknown – bounds have to be taken into account. We hope that our computations provide a helpful basis towards this task.

REFERENCES

[1] Oswin Aichholzer. Extremal Properties of 0/1-Polytopes of Dimension 5. In Gil Kalai and Günter M. Ziegler, editors, *Polytopes — Combinatorics and Computation*, pages 111–130. Birkhäuser, 2000.

[2] Sanjeev Arora, Rong Ge, Ravindran Kannan, and Ankur Moitra. Computing a nonnegative matrix factorization – provably. In *Proceedings of the 44th symposium on Theory of Computing*, STOC '12, pages 145–162, New York, 2012. ACM.

[3] Egon Balas. Disjunctive programming. *Annals of Discrete Mathematics*, 5:3–51, 1979.

[4] Saugata Basu, Richard Pollack, and Marie-Françoise Roy. On the combinatorial and algebraic complexity of quantifier elimination. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 43(6):1002–1045, 1996.

[5] Samuel Fiorini, Volker Kaibel, Kanstantsin Pashkovich, and Dirk Oliver Theis. Combinatorial bounds on nonnegative rank and extended formulations. *Discrete Math.*, 313(1):67–83, 2013.

[6] Samuel Fiorini, Serge Massar, Sebastian Pokutta, Hans Raj Tiwary, and Ronald de Wolf. Linear vs. semidefinite extended formulations: exponential separation and strong lower bounds. In *STOC*, pages 95–106, 2012.
[7] Komei Fukuda. cdd and cddplus homepage. `http://www.ifor.math.ethz.ch/~fukuda/cdd_home/index.html`, April 2014.
[8] Ewgenij Gawrilow and Michael Joswig. polymake: a framework for analyzing convex polytopes. In Gil Kalai and Günter M. Ziegler, editors, *Polytopes — Combinatorics and Computation*, pages 43–74. Birkhäuser, 2000.
[9] João Gouveia, , Richard Z. Robinson, and Rekha R. Thomas. Polytopes of minimum positive semidefinite rank. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 50(3):679–699, 2013.
[10] Volker Kaibel. Extended formulations in combinatorial optimization. Optima 85, 2011. 14 pages.
[11] Volker Kaibel and Kanstantsin Pashkovich. Constructing extended formulations from reflection relations. In Michael Jünger and Gerhard Reinelt, editors, *Facets of Combinatorial Optimization – Festschrift for Martin Grötschel*, pages 77–100. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2013.
[12] Troy Lee and Dirk Oliver Theis. Support-based lower bounds for the positive semidefinite rank of a nonnegative matrix. arXiv:1203.3961, 2012.
[13] Kanstantsin Pashkovich and Stefan Weltge. Hidden vertices in extensions of polytopes. arXiv:1404.2752, 2014.
[14] Thomas Rothvoß. The matching polytope has exponential extension complexity. arXiv:1311.2369, 2013.
[15] Mihalis Yannakakis. Expressing combinatorial optimization problems by linear programs. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 43(3):441–466, 1991.

APPENDIX

A.1. **Proof of Lemma 2.3.** Let (Q,π) be an extension for $P \neq \emptyset$ such that $Q \subseteq \mathbb{R}^q$ has smallest possible dimension and let us write $Q = \mathrm{conv}(V) + \mathrm{rec}(Q)$ with $\emptyset \neq V \subseteq \mathbb{R}^q$ finite. Suppose for the sake of contradiction that Q is unbounded, i.e., there exists vector $c \in \mathrm{rec}(Q) \setminus \{\mathbb{O}\}$. Since

$$P = \pi(Q) = \pi(Q + \mathrm{rec}(Q)) = \pi(Q) + \pi(\mathrm{rec}(Q)) = P + \pi(\mathrm{rec}(Q))$$

and P is bounded, we see that the $\mathrm{rec}(Q)$ lies in the kernel of π.

Let $\gamma := \max\{\langle c, v\rangle : v \in \mathrm{conv}(V)\}$ and define $Q' := \{y \in Q : \langle c, y\rangle = \gamma\}$. We claim that (Q',π) is an extension for P. Clearly, it holds that $\pi(Q') \subseteq P$. For any $x \in P$ let $y = v + w \in Q$ such that $\pi(y) = x$ with $v \in \mathrm{conv}(V)$ and $w \in \mathrm{rec}(Q)$. Setting $\lambda := \frac{\gamma - \langle c, v\rangle}{\|c\|^2} \geq 0$ and $y' := v + \lambda c \in Q$, we have that

$$\langle c, y'\rangle = \langle c, v + \lambda c\rangle = \langle c, v\rangle + \langle c, \frac{\gamma - \langle c, v\rangle}{\|c\|^2} \cdot c\rangle = \langle c, v\rangle + \gamma - \langle c, v\rangle = \gamma$$

and hence $y' \in Q'$. Moreover, we obtain

$$\pi(y') = \pi(v) + \lambda\pi(c) = \pi(v) = \pi(v) + \pi(w) = \pi(y) = x,$$

which implies $x \in \pi(Q')$ and thus $\pi(Q') = P$ holds indeed.

Observing that $\dim(Q') < \dim(Q)$ and that Q' has at most as many facets as Q yields the desired contradiction. □